Questions & Answers
SITE NAME: SS Express Lane - Franksville
COMM #53126-9619-25
BRRTS #03-52-283965

QUESTION: Current Property Operations. Discussions with the Responsible Party (RP) have indicated that the property is currently owned and operated by a "third party." The scope of work does not reference whether that station business shall remain fully or partially operable during the execution of the Bid round 52, scope of services for this Site? (i.e. should the bid logistics assume that the station's business operations remain operable?)

ANSWER: PECFA can only reimburse for the least costly remedial approach. Whether or not the station remains operable is not for a regulatory agency to determine. The property owner, responsible party and consultant can make arrangements for keeping the station operating as much as possible.

QUESTION: Shoring System. The bid document's scope references shoring for stabilization of the excavation sidewalls to achieve the excavation depth(s) of 16 feet. In consideration for the answer for question No.1 with the understanding that the stations operations are to remain active during the remedial activity, the following questions/concerns were provided:

a. The RP has indicated that the UST system, dispensers, lines, and canopy footings were backfilled with pea gravel at the time they were installed in 2000. Therefore, should an engineered (Professional Engineer Approved) shoring system be considered/implemented to preserve UST system integrity, the building footings, and other sub-grade structural footings for the canopy, dispensers, and signage?

ANSWER:

a. Yes, an engineered shoring system should be implemented. It is up to the consultant and their respective contractor(s) to ensure that all of the structures on the property are returned to as good or better condition as they were when remediation started. Commerce requires that consultants and consulting firms be insured and bonded.

b. The UST systems leak detection system has been tripped during prior drilling/probing operations. Shoring systems that are driven via a vibratory hammer will likely disrupt the leak detection system. Will the resulting alarms be perceived as a compliance problem? Will COMM issue a variance to allow the alarms during the installation of a driven shoring system?

ANSWER:

b. If the leak detection system generates an alarm during remediation activities, it will not be perceived as a compliance problem, however; it should be noted in the station records. No "variance" for alarms during remediation is required. During remediation activities, the station owner should continue normal monthly inventory record keeping and monthly monitoring methods to make sure that the system provides passing tank

and line tests from the automatic tank gauge (ATG). A copy of the passing (ATG) tests should be included in the report.

c. Electrical lines exist for both the sign and a tire inflation air and vacuum station which run across the former dispenser island excavation. Can the shoring system and excavation limits be adjusted or reduced to allow for these utilities to remain undisturbed?

ANSWER:

c. Yes, the limits of the excavation can be adjusted based on field observations of contaminated areas; however, the departments do not want the excavation reduced in the area that appears to be highly contaminated, such as in the utility area. Hand digging to expose the electrical lines may be necessary. DNR and Commerce assume that all underground utilities and private lines will be marked prior to commencing remedial efforts. Consultants and consulting firms are required to be insured and bonded.

d. The figure provided in the Bid document included a municipal water lateral extending across the excavation. The RP has indicated that a potable well exists on-Site behind the building structure and that no municipal water lateral is present on-Site.

ANSWER:

d. Prior to bid preparation DNR and Commerce were informed that the water lateral from Highway K to the convenience store existed and was in use. The potable well is understood to be present as well. Bidders should assume that the water lateral exists and to take care when excavating this area. Again, all utilities and private lines are to be marked prior to commencing remediation activities.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

e. If a shoring system is installed the sidewalls of the excavation would not be exposed. How are sidewall samples referenced in the bid document to be collected?

ANSWER:

e. DNR and Commerce understand that sidewall samples will not be collected where shoring is necessary.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

QUESTION: If the station is to remain in operation, a "phased excavation approach" with several excavation shoring systems would likely be required leading to additional costs. Are the bidders to assume a phased excavation approach?

ANSWER: No, bidders may approach the excavation in another manner. PECFA can only reimburse for the least costly remedial approach. Whether or not the station remains operable is not for a regulatory agency to determine. The property owner, responsible party and consultant can make arrangements for keeping the station operating as much as possible.

QUESTION: Seasonal Considerations for Excavation. The COMM 47 schedule requirements for a Bid project associated with bid review, awarding the bid, and contract execution and initiation/completion of the work have no consideration for seasonal complications associated with remedial excavations. Can the bidders

assume that the work will proceed after June 2008 to minimize excavation water issues associated with the spring thaw and spring storm events?

ANSWER: All bid deadline requirements as outlined in the bid document must be adhered to in order to maximize reimbursement. Commerce requires work to commence within 45 days of executing a contract; however, "work" does not necessarily mean the start of excavation.

QUESTION: Backfilling and Compaction. The bid document references backfilling and compaction with a low permeability silt and/or clay-rich fill material. Also, the excavation and subsequent backfill limits are in areas that receive heavy (large commercial truck) traffic. The following questions are provided:

f. Does the backfilling and compaction require compaction testing?

g. The bid documents backfill specifications make no reference to base course, or traffic bond aggregate for the final 12-inches of backfill. Should the bidders consider a WISDOT compliant material as base course for the final 12-inches of backfill?

ANSWER:

f. Yes, it is up to the consultant and their respective contractor(s) to ensure that all of the structures on the property are returned to as good or better condition as they were when remediation started. Commerce and DNR assume that consultants, contractors and sub-contractors are familiar with appropriate backfilling and compaction requirements for this type of situation.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

g. Bidders should assume a compliant material as base course for the final 12-inches of backfill consistent with the intended business use.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

QUESTION: Soil Tonnage. The bid document references 2,125 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil will be removed from the Site. Disposal and tipping charges are based on tonnage. Are the bidders to assume 1.6 tons per cubic yard conversion factor?

ANSWER: No, for bidding purposes assume 3,200 tons of petroleum contaminated soil is to be removed.